

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawing include changes to Fig. 5. The sheet, which includes Fig. 5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet: 1 (One)

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-4 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 2-4 are rejected.

The Specification has been objected to by the Examiner.

The drawings have been objected to by the Examiner.

Claim 2 is objected to because of informalities.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aisaki (US 6405089) in view of McNeil (US 2002/0146347).

***Examiner Interview***

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held on August 25, 2010, and the suggestions made therein by the Examiner. The Applicants respectfully amend the claims in view of the suggestions. Specifically, the Applicants clarify further the subject matter of the invention.

***Specification***

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract as being longer than 150 words. However, the Applicants submitted a revised Abstract along with the Amendment filed on April 19, 2009, which is less than 150 words. Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw this objection.

***Drawings***

The Applicants respectfully submit a revised Fig. 5 with item 54a duly marked therein.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 2 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 2 has been revised to replace the "for clauses" with a more acceptable form as suggested by the Examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Applicants respectfully amend claim 2 based on the discussion during the telephonic interview with the Examiner. Amended claim 2 is believed to proper under section 112.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aisaki in view of McNeill.

As discussed with the Examiner during the telephonic interview, the present invention requires a current controlling device that is configured to control a rectified current of the current control rectifying element. Further, after the current controlling device reduces the rectified current, it stops a power feeding operation using an instruction for turning off the power supply to the driving unit. Subsequently, after a predetermined time after the instruction the contact of the relay apparatus is opened.

Because of the above features of the invention, a problem of rush current and the arc produced in the contacts of the relay apparatus are avoided.

The Examiner cites to col. 6 lines 35-42 of Aisaki in support of his assertion that the above feature is suggested by Aisaki. Aisaki discloses a treatment apparatus for patients that can

deliver both AC and DC treatment voltages. In Aisaki, a user closes the movable contact  $S_s$ . This causes 12 V DC to be supplied to the LSI 7. After which the timer of the LSI 7 is initiated. After 5 seconds, trigger current is supplied to the gate of the thyristor. During the five seconds, charges of 12 kV DC charged in the capacitor are discharged by flowing into the higher resistance R. This decreases the generation of the arc at the switching of the high voltage reed relays.

As can be clearly seen, the above suggestion of Aisaki is completely different from the inventive feature of the present invention described above. Notably, Aisaki suggestion relates to deceasing the arc in relay circuits on swathing on the circuits. Further, the decreasing of the arc is achieved by discharging a 12 kv DC voltage in a capacitor. This is completely different the present invention which relates to shutting off of the power supply. Further, in the present invention, the controlling device reduces the rectified current and then it stops a power feeding operation using an instruction for turning off the power supply to the driving unit. Discharging a capacitor as in Aisaki is completely different from a controlling device reducing the rectified current.

A skilled artisan would not have been able to make the present invention based on the combined teachings of Aisaki and MaCneil.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/533,569

Attorney Docket No.: Q87581

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

**65565**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 1, 2010

---

Chid S. Iyer  
Registration No. 43,355